spots on the feathers of the upper surface rufous-buff instead of whitish yellow.


## 66. Sterna longipennis.

Sterna longipennis, Nordm. ; Salvad. t. c. iii. p. 439.
a. $\delta$ ad. Rubiana; 4.3.87. Bill black; legs black; feet black. Food, fish.

March 20, 1888.
Henry Seebohm, Esq., F.Z.S., in the Chair.

The followiug papers were read :-
> 1. Note on the Classification of the Ranida.

> By G. A. Boulenger.

[Received February 10, 1888.]
When revising the arrangement of the tailless Batrachians for the second edition of the British Museum Catalogue (1882), I had very great difficulty in dealing with the subdivision of the large family Ranida. I had to abandon the Platy- and Oxydactyle character as a generic one, finding that, to say nothing of the complete intergradation which destroys its usefulness as an artificial character, it did not, by itself, express affinity, and that in consequence satisfactory series could not be formed upon the degree of dilatation or acumination of the digits. As an instance, I may refer to Rance malabarica, galamensis, macrodactyla, and lateralis, which are unquestionably very intimately related to such forms as constitute the platydactyle group Hylorana of certain authors (R. erythrea, temporalis, chalconota, $\dot{\alpha} \mathrm{c}$.), and yet are more 'oxydactyle' than Rance macrodon, kullii, and many others which have by all authors, and very justly, been regarded as true Rance. I cannot see that the union of all these species, however numerous, under one genus, Rana, presents any serious inconvenience. On the contrary, the systematist should form well-defined genera, regardless of the
number of species they may embrace ; by so doing he firstly facilitates identification, for the student has a right to expect, when using a synoptic work, to get at the name of the genus before that of the species; and secondly, he more correctly expresses the continnity and breaks in the series of forms as exist in Nature at the present period. This mode of treatment has therefore both a practical and a philosophical bearing.

My arrangement has not met with general aeceptance. As for myself, I have not lost sight of the question during the six years that have elapsed since the publication of my classification, and I have, on different occasions, taken up the matter again in the hope of finding characters upon which to subdivide the genus Rana, but without success; and I am now more than ever convinced that it is a natural association. This conviction has been confirmed by a discovery published by Peters (Reise n. Mossamb. iii. 1882), shortly after the issue of the British Museum Catalogue. He found that the digits of most of his Polypedatince differ from those of the Ranince by the presence of a small additional phalanx between the nhimate and what is normally the penultimate; the number of phalanges being $3,3,4,4$ in the fore limb, and $3,3,4,5,4$ in the hind limb, instead of $2,2,3,3$ and $2,2,3,4,3$. After testing the constancy of this character, I fully endorse Peters's view as to its taxonomic importance; it affords a far better character for separating Rhacophorus from Runa than does the presence of a web between the fingers. And I find, with satisfaction, that all the species referred by me, from autoptic examination, to the genus Rana have the normal phalanges, irrespective of the presence or absence or size of the digital expansions. Two species which were formerly unknown to me, but of which specimens are now in the Museurn, viz. Hyla buergeri, Schleg., and Theloderma leprosum,'Tsch. ( = Polypedates leprosus, Gthr.), must, in spite of their free fingers, be referred to Rhacophorus. I also find that Cassina, though oxydactyle, and therefore placed by Peters in his Ranince, has the additional phalanx like its close ally IIylambates; and that the genus Jxalus, as hitherto defined, is umatural, the species opisthorhodus, Gthr., silvaticus, Blgr., fuscus, Blgr., saxicola, Jerd., and doubtless also sarasinorum, F. Müll., all from Southern India and Ceylon, standing in the same relation to Rana as the typical Ixali to Rhacophorus. For these species, characterized by the normal number of phalanges, I propose the generic name Micrixalus. Considering the importance of the character discovered by Peters, I would suggest the division of the Ranide into two groups, that which is characterized by the additional phalanx embracing the following genera:-

Cassina, Gir., Hylambates, A. Dum., Rappin, G'thr., Megalixa. lus, Gthr., Rhacophorus, Kuhl, Chiromantis, Ptrs., Ixalus, Tsch., and Nyctixalus, Blgr.

The following figures show that the character npon which these two groups are based is readily ascertainable.
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1. Finger of thatophomus maximus.
2. Finger of liana afyhana.
a. Upper view. b. Side view. $a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}$. Skeleton.

I seize this opportnnity to remark that the genus Phyllobates, Bibr., is a Ranoid, closely allied to and intermediate between Hyl iaalus, Espada, and Prostherapis, Cope-differing from the former in the free toes, and from the latter in the notched tongue. The pectoral girdle of the type specimen of Phyllobates bicolor, Bibr., as well as of a specimen of $P$. melanorhinus, Berth., has been kindly examined at my request by Dr. Mocquard. That genus includes the following five sprecies :-P. bicolor, Bibr., limbatus, Cope, melanorhinus, Berth., trinitatis, Garm., and trilineatus, Blgr.

There probably exists, however, a group of Cystignathoids answering to Cope's definition of Phyllobates (Jomrn. Ac. Philad. vi. 1866, p. 96)-that is, Hylodes without vomerine teeth, which would bear the name Syrrhopus, Cope (Am. Nat. 187S, p. 253), and include Malachylodes, Cope, and Hypodictyon, Cope. Not having seen examples of any of the following species, I ouly suggest that they may be mited provisionally under the term Syrrhopus, and with the generic definition given on p. 195 of iny Catalogue :S. marnockii, Cope, leprus, Cope, cystignathoides, Cope, verrucipes, Cope, guttulatus, Cope, hyleformis, Cope, ridens, Cope, chalceus, Ptrs., and verruculatus, Ptrs.

